

The Translation of the Scriptures and the Ecumenical Patriarchate: The Translation Efforts of Hilarion of Tirnovo

NOMIKOS M. VAPORIS

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, Constantinople continued to be the intellectual and religious centre of the Greeks despite rival flourishing educational and economic centres in such cities as Smyrna, Kydonies (Aivali), and Chios. Moreover, it was the 'national' centre of the Greek people. It was natural, therefore, that the subject of a new translation of the Scriptures,¹ a project affecting all Greeks, should have arisen once more in the Ottoman capital.

For a second time, the stimulus for a translation originated outside of the Greek world, and, not surprisingly, in a Protestant centre. This time it came from the British and not the Dutch. More specifically, the origin of the new controversy over the translation of the Scriptures into modern Greek can be

1. The first complete translation of the Scriptures, confined to the New Testament, was made during the patriarchal tenure of Kyrillos I Loukaris (1612; 1620–38 intermittently). The translation was the work of Loukaris' close friend, Archimandrite Maximos Kallipolites and was 'inspired' by the Calvinist Cornelius van Haga, ambassador of the Netherlands to the Ottoman Porte. For this chapter of the translation controversy see my study, *The Controversy on the Translation of the Scriptures into Modern Greek and its Effects, 1818–1843* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1970). The study was published by Georgetown Publications in a limited edition for private circulation. The present article is from the same study, slightly revised.

traced to the work and activities of the British and Foreign Bible Society.²

The Bible Society was founded in March 1804 with the purpose of distributing the Christian Bible in as many understandable languages and countries as possible.³ In 1807 it turned its attention to the Greeks for the first time, but without taking any positive action.⁴

At its next annual meeting, however, Dr. Adam Clarke, a Bible Society agent, in a memorandum to the Society, expressed some doubt as to whether the Greeks would receive a modern translation of the Scriptures with any favour. Nevertheless, he felt that an attempt should be made. He consequently recommended three things: (1) the Halle edition of 1710 should be reprinted, (2) the original text of the New Testament should accompany the translation in parallel columns, and (3) zealous individuals should be found in Greece to distribute the volumes.⁵

What in all probability moved the Society to go ahead with its Greek New Testament project at this time was the favourable report, dated 17 December 1808, submitted by the Revd. John F. Usko.⁶

Usko had spent considerable time living among the Greeks, particularly in Smyrna, where he served as chaplain to the British Station, and had just been expelled from Turkey as a result of the worsening relations in 1808 between that country and Britain. He was of the opinion that a new translation should be sought from some skilled and learned priest of Constantinople with the agreement and concurrence of the Patriarch, and that it should be executed under the latter's direction and supervision.⁷

2. For the early history of the Bible Society, see J. J. Owen, *The History of the Origin and First Ten Years of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (New York, 1817). A much more comprehensive work is C. Canton, *A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (5 vols.; London, 1904–10).

3. 'The sole object . . . of the Society is to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures . . . without note or comment'. See *Reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society with Extracts of Correspondence, etc. . . . Volume the First for the Years 1805 to 1810 Inclusive, Reprinted from the Original Reports* (London, 1811), p.

3. Hereafter the work will be cited as B.F.B.S., *Report No. X (XXXX)*.

4. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 4 (1808)*, p. 175.

5. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 5 (1809)*, p. 249.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 250.

7. *Ibid.*

Usko further noted that the Greeks had translated many works into their spoken language which, in his opinion, differed as much from the Ancient Greek as Italian from Latin. In fact, he observed that modern Greek was being used in all translations among the Greeks, even in the preaching, though the services continued to be celebrated in the 'ancient language'.⁸ In the end, Usko recommended the project be initiated, although he could not give any assurance as to its favourable outcome.⁹

In the meantime, the Society received a rather substantial donation for the printing of a New Testament in a modern Greek translation. In May 1809 it was reported that five thousand copies had been ordered from the printers of the Halle edition which was to be ready in the following year.¹⁰

Undoubtedly, Adamantios Koraes' letter to the Bible Society, which had written and asked for his opinion on the subject,¹¹ helped the Society come to the above decision, for Koraes at this time was the leading Greek *savant* with a pan-Greek reputation and following. In his answer, dated 19 November 1808, Koraes expressed the opinion that the two previous modern Greek editions of the New Testament, those of 1638 and 1703, should be thoroughly revised and published in a third edition.¹² Regarding the Old Testament, Koraes suggested a new translation based not on the Septuagint, the version in use among the Greeks from the beginning of their conversion to Christianity, but on the Hebrew text. The former, he felt, could

8. By the 'ancient' language, Usko undoubtedly meant not Classical Greek but Byzantine, which derived from Atticistic Greek.

9. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 5 (1809)*, p. 250.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 268 and *Report No. 6 (1810)*, p. 293.

11. The Society's letter to Koraes is not extant nor is Koraes' original letter in French. See *ibid.*, pp. 252–3 for the English translation. Richard Clogg, who has searched the archives of the Bible Society, has discovered a more complete text in English. See his 'The Correspondence of Adamantios Korais with the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1808', *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, XIV (1969), 65–84.

12. The 1638 edition was published in Geneva and was authored by Maximos Kallipolites; the 1703 edition was published in London by Archimandrite Serapheim of Mytiline with some revisions, while the 1710 edition, unknown to Koraes, was published without revisions in Halle, Saxony, by Anastasios Michaelos of Naousa, Macedonia. See Vaporis, *The Controversy*, pp. 21–2, 25–7; Adamantios Koraes, *Ἀτακτα*, III (Paris, 1830), p. viii.

be used as a reference only, and its variants should be printed at the bottom of the text of the translation in deference to the great veneration it commanded among the Greeks. This veneration or prejudice—both words are employed—would wane, he thought, as the Greeks became more enlightened.¹³

Later events, however, were to prove Koraes wrong because when the Bible Society did reject the Septuagint for the Hebrew text it provided the opponents of the translation with ‘proof’ that sacred tradition was under attack.

The Bible Society had also asked Koraes to recommend translators. On this subject he was certain that there were none capable among the Greeks at that time. Koraes believed a translation required people who commanded not only ancient and modern Greek, but Hebrew as well, all necessary for a good modern Greek translation. He, therefore, proposed to the Society that it sponsor the training of two young Greeks who would prepare themselves for this task.

In a postscript to the same letter, Koraes remembered a Greek deacon, newly arrived in Paris for studies, whom he recommended as a likely candidate. The young deacon was Neophytos Vamvas, who was to play a very prominent role in the controversy a few decades later when it reappeared for a third time in Greece proper. Nothing, however, came of Koraes’ entire proposal. Koraes did not become further involved in the project, nor did Vamvas go to England to study Hebrew.¹⁴ What did happen was that the 1710 edition of Maximos Kallipolites’ translation was republished exactly one hundred years following its first appearance.¹⁵

From the reports it received from the field after 1810, the Society had every reason to congratulate itself on making the right decision. Copies of the translation, it was reported, were gratefully received by the Greeks in the Greek Islands,¹⁶ in Smyrna, where the Metropolitan received it ‘graciously’ and made a request for a modern translation of the Old

13. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 5 (1809)*, p. 252.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 253.

15. T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule, *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (2 vols.; London, 1903), II, 680–1; B.F.B.S., *Report No. 15 (1819)*, p. 204.

16. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 8 (1812)*, pp. 205, 223, 235, 522.

Testament,¹⁷ and on Malta, where an archimandrite asked for a thousand copies to be sent to the Holy Synod of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to be distributed among the Orthodox there.¹⁸ Although no decision was taken on the archimandrite's request, copies were sent to both the Morea and Constantinople, but not, to our knowledge, to the Patriarchate directly.

As a result of all this encouraging news, the Society went ahead with another printing which appeared in 1814.¹⁹ Nevertheless, some opposition to the circulation of the translation did appear, for the Revd. Henry Lindsay, Chaplain to the British Embassy at Constantinople, reported that he 'was given to understand that the Greek priests would do all in their power to thwart and render ineffectual any . . . distribution' unless it received formal patriarchal sanction. Another objection, he felt, would come from the Greek monks, who although not opposed to the circulation of the Scriptures, would consider the absence of the Apocrypha a mutilation of the Bible.²⁰

Both as a matter of principle as well as a matter of precaution—to forestall as much of the opposition as possible—Henry Lindsay visited Patriarch Kyrillos VI (1813–18) to discuss with him the question of the distribution of the translated New Testament. Although we have no record of their deliberations, they were successful if we judge by the events that followed. Upon leaving, Lindsay left for the Patriarch an Extract from the 'Summary Account' of the Society in addition to a copy of the 1810 translation.²¹

On a return visitation, Lindsay heard Patriarch Kyrillos laud

17. Ibid., p. 417. The metropolitan also had a copy of the Halle 1710 edition.

18. Ibid., p. 236.

19. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 11 (1815)*, p. 467; Darlow-Moule, *Catalogue*, II, 681.

20. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 11 (1815)*, p. 467. Most Orthodox consider such books as Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah, Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom of Solomon (Ecclesiasticus), Wisdom of Sirach (Ben Sirach), and Maccabees as Deutero-Canonical, while others attribute to them full canonical status. For a discussion of the Septuagint canon, see V. Antoniadēs, *Ἐγχειρίδιον εἰσαγωγῆς εἰς τὰς Ἀγίας Γραφάς, Τόμος Α. Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Παλαιὰν Διαθήκη* (Athens, 1936), pp. 25–7. A briefer and more accessible discussion can be found in F. Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought* (London, 1923), pp. 19–20.

21. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 11 (1815)*, p. 467.

the objectives of the Society and received from him a letter, dated 13 December 1814, in which the Patriarch confirmed the accuracy of the translation and authorized it to be read and sold by Greek Orthodox Christians 'without any doubt or hesitation'.²²

Later opponents of the modern translation, uncomfortable over the favour shown to the translation by the Patriarch of Constantinople, tried to explain away Kyrillos' decision by questioning the validity of the Patriarch's action and by suggesting that outside influences were at work. The evidence available, however, does not support these opinions. Nor, it should be pointed out, is there evidence of any psychological or diplomatic pressure being exerted on the Patriarch.²³

In reporting his success, Lindsay recommended to the Society that the Patriarch's letter of approval be printed in each copy of the 'Romaic' testament. Strangely, the Society did not follow through with this suggestion in its 1815 printing, though it would have been to its advantage, but contented itself with the following terse notice: 'This diglot edition received the special and formal sanction of Cyril, Archbishop of Constantinople, and Oecumenical Patriarch.'²⁴

In the meantime, the Society continued to receive favourable reports from its agents in the field.²⁵ Lindsay reported his

22. Ibid., p. 470. The Patriarch's original letter in Greek is reproduced on pp. 468–9.

23. K. Oikonomos, in his *Ἐπὶ κρισις εἰς τὴν περὶ νεοελληνικῆς ἐκκλησίας σύντομον ἀπάντησιν τοῦ σοφολογιώτατου Κυρίου Νεοφύτου Βάμβα* (Athens, 1839), p. 305, attributes Kyrillos' permission to the Patriarch's 'simplicity of soul' while M. Siotes, *Ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος Οἰκονόμος ὁ ἐξ Οἰκονόμων καὶ αἱ μεταφορές τῆς Ἀγίας Γραφῆς εἰς τὴν Νεοελληνικὴν*, in *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Ἀριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονικῆς*, III (1959), 13–14 [English translation in *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, VI (1960), 7–55], actually uses the phrase 'psychological and diplomatic blackmail'. Ibid., p. 14.

24. See Barlow-Moule, *Catalogue*, II, 681. The absence of the Patriarch's letter is characterized as a deliberate abuse by M. Siotes, *Οἰκονόμος*, p. 18. There is no proof, however, that the Patriarch issued the letter with the understanding that it was to appear in each volume.

25. Perhaps its greatest piece of news was the approval of a Russian Bible Society by Tsar Alexander I in 1813. The R.B.S. issued a bilingual Greek New Testament in 1817 for the Greeks of the Ukraine, followed by a complete diglot Bible in 1821. See Darlow-Moule, *Catalogue*, II, 642. For the R.B.S. see B.F.B.S., *Report No. 9 (1813)*, pp. 367–8, 494–5; S. R. Tompkins, 'The Russian

own experiences with the Greek Hierarchs in such cities of Asia Minor as: Alah Shehir (Philadelphia), Ak-hisar (Thyateira), and others.²⁶ In addition, the Society received a letter from the Metropolitan of Ioannina, Gabriel (1810–26), who stated that the translation had been received with thankfulness in Cyprus, Rhodes, and Crete. In his own diocese, to which he had just come, he personally distributed the translation, and on Sundays prayed for the success and welfare of the Society.²⁷ Finally, Metropolitan Gabriel added his own wish, to others received, to have the entire Bible translated.

Another of the Society's agents, the Revd. William Jowett, presented further confirmation that the translation was being well received. In Aivali (Kydonies) of Asia Minor, for example, where he visited the Greek college, seventy-two out of two hundred students ordered eighty-five copies of the translation.²⁸

Despite its success with the reprinted 1710 edition, the Society had not forgotten the suggestion for a new translation, made a few years previously by both John Usko and Adamantios Koraes. Furthermore, this edition was basically two hundred years old, and changes in the Greek language had to be considered as well as the absence of a translation of the Old Testament for which requests had been received.²⁹

The task of securing a new translation of the entire Bible was assigned to the British chaplain in Smyrna, the Revd. Charles

Bible Society: A Case of Religious Xenophobia', *The American Slavic and East European Review*, VII (1948), 251–68; and Judith C. Zacek, 'The Russian Bible Society and the Russian Orthodox Church', *Church History*, XXXV (1966), 411–37. Interestingly enough, Judith Zacek (*ibid.*, p. 417) notes that Alexander in emphasizing the need for a Russian translation from the Slavonic, pointed out to the Holy Synod 'that the Greek Patriarch had already authorized a modern Greek version of the New Testament for the Greek Orthodox flock'. Siotes (*Οικονόμος*, p. 9), on the other hand, believes that it was the Greeks who were influenced by the Russian example. In this instance, both are correct. The Russians were influenced by the approbation of Kyrillos VI, while Gregorios V had his opinion reinforced by the Russian decision.

26. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 12* (1816), pp. 134–5.

27. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 13* (1817), p. 26.

28. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 15* (1819), p. 203. It is interesting to note that Jowett expressed sincere joy over the progress being made by the Greeks in education. *Ibid.*

29. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 153.

Williamson, in the spring of 1818. Williamson was also instructed to seek official sanction for the new edition.³⁰

A report sent to the Society by one of its more prominent agents, the Revd. Robert Pinkerton, informs us that Williamson travelled to Constantinople soon afterwards and was brought into contact with Archimandrite Hilarion of Sinai. Hilarion was an acceptable candidate for the job of translator because, as Pinkerton stated, his name was mentioned to him during his travels in Greece as the one person specifically qualified for the task.³¹ To this must be added that Hilarion was the choice of the patriarchal circles, as he personally intimates.³²

That Hilarion was equally acceptable to both Pinkerton and Patriarch Kyrillos for the translation is no surprise. A learned cleric who had studied at the ecclesiastical school on the island of Patmos, Hilarion came from Crete, the home of many distinguished Greek clergymen. In Constantinople, he served as the overseer (*hegoumenos*) of an ecclesiastical endowment (*metochi*) belonging to the Archdiocese of Mt. Sinai, whose hierarchical see was occupied by Archbishop Konstantios, also a Cretan. At the time, Konstantios lived in Constantinople and was both

30. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 15 (1819)*, p. 202. See also Neophytos Vamvas, 'Αντεπίκρισις εἰς τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πρεσβυτέρου καὶ Οἰκονόμου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ ἐξ Οἰκονόμου ἐπίκρισιν (Athens, 1839), p. 33. [Hereafter cited as Vamvas, 'Αντεπίκρισις].

31. B.F.B.S., *Report NNo. 16 (1820)*, p. 19.

32. See Matthew of Kyzikos, 'Αντίρρησις τοῦ πανιερωτάτου δαιδύμου μητροπολίτου Κυζίκου (τοῦ ἀπὸ Θεσσαλονίκης) Κυρίου Ματθαίου πρὸς τὴν ἐν εἶδει 'Απολογία περὶ τῆς εἰς τὸ χυδαῖον ἰδίωμα μεταφράσεως τῶν 'Ιερῶν Γραφῶν ἀποσταλεῖσαν τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλῃ 'Εκκλησίᾳ ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίτου Τουρνόβου 'Ιλαρίωνος: 'Ης προσετέθη εἰσαγωγή, κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τῆς 'Εκκλησίας, συνταχθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιεπίσκοπου τῆς ἐν Κουρούτζεσμε τοῦ Γένους Σχολῆ, Π. Μ. Σαμουὴλ Κυπρίου. 'Εξεδόθη ἤδη ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλῃς 'Εκκλησίας χάριν τῶν 'Ορθοδόξων (Constantinople, 1841), pp. xxviii–xxix. Hereafter this work will be cited thus: Matthew of Kyzikos, 'Αντίρρησις when reference is made to the main body of the work, and Samuel Kyprίου, *Εἰσαγωγή* when referring to the introduction of 1841. Cf. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23 (1827)*, p. 154. See also Library of the Theological School of Halke, MS. No. 192, p. 7. (Hereafter cited as Halke MS. No. 192.) This MS. contains Hilarion's 'Εκθεσις (Report) and 'Απολογία (Apologia). Subsequent to the writing of this study both were published in an admirable study by V. Sphyroeras, 'Ιλαρίων Συναΐτης ὁ Κρής (1765;–1838) καὶ αἱ δύο ἐπιστολαὶ του περὶ τῆς μεταφράσεως τῶν 'Αγίων Γραφῶν, 'Επιστημονικὴ 'Επετηρὶς τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου 'Αθηνῶν, XX (1970), 252–301. Hereafter cited as Sphyroeras, 'Ιλαρίων.

Hilarion's superior and friend. Later, the archbishop would serve as editor of the translation. In addition, Hilarion was also entrusted with the general supervision of the Patriarchal Press.³³

Hilarion quickly came to an oral agreement with Williamson to translate both the Old and New Testaments, to correct the proofs, and to supervise the printing of the text.³⁴ Although there was no mention of Patriarch Kyrillos in Pinkerton's report, it seems reasonable to assume both from his previous attitude on the subject and Hilarion's relations with the Patriarch that he was cognizant of the arrangement and had given his approval.

Hilarion began his work immediately. A few months later, Williamson wrote to him from Smyrna, and requested that a sample of the translation be sent to the learned priest, Konstantinos Oikonomos, then teaching in the same city, so that the latter might review the work.³⁵ Complying with Williamson's request, Hilarion sent to Oikonomos two note books (*tetradia*) of the translation together with a personal letter dated 26 October.³⁶

In reply, Oikonomos expressed his embarrassment for being asked to review the translation. Further, he expressed his joy over the knowledge that Hilarion had undertaken the task, and praised Williamson for his excellent choice.³⁷ In Oikonomos'

33. On Hilarion see *ibid.*, 225–51; J. F. Clarke, *Bible Societies, American Missionaries, and the National Revival of Bulgaria* (New York, 1971), *passim*; *idem*, 'Hilarion of Tirnovo in the Light of Historic Criticism', *Actes du Premier Congrès International des Études Balkaniques et Sud-Est Européennes*, IV (1968), 260–78, and N. Phoropoulos, 'Ιλαρίων ὁ Τορνόβου, Θρησκευτική καὶ Ἠθική Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια, VI (1965), cols. 870–1.

34. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16* (1820), p. 19.

35. Vamvas, 'Ἀντεκτίκρσις, p. 33.

36. *Ibid.*, pp. xlv–xlvii. Siotes' contention (Οἰκονόμος, p. 19) that Williamson preferred Oikonomos to Hilarion as translator, but that the Bible Society agent realized, from his conversations with Oikonomos, that the latter would not 'serve the purposes of the enemies of Orthodoxy', is to be rejected. In this instance, Pinkerton's information (B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16* [1820], p. 19) and Vamvas' ('Ἀντεκτίκρσις, p. 303) is more reliable while Siotes' is based on speculation. It is true that Williamson considered Oikonomos for the job, but the latter was too 'busy' then. See J. F. Clarke, *Bible Societies*, p. 138.

37. Later, Oikonomos ('Ἐπτεκτίκρσις, p. 303) would call Hilarion a hireling of the Bible Society.

opinion, Hilarion possessed the brilliant knowledge required for translating the Scriptures, a task which he considered both sacred and useful.³⁸

From the portions of the translation sent to him, Oikonomos found the work 'very praiseworthy', 'clear', 'rich', 'exact', 'thorough', and 'all together an excellent job'.³⁹ He agreed with Hilarion that the language used for the translation should not be too common but somewhat elevated to be attractive to the educated as well, even though their mutual friend, Williamson, had wanted the work done in a more simple Greek. Finally, Oikonomos informed Hilarion that he too had been working on the New Testament for three years, but planned to delay its publication, and would in all probability abandon it altogether since Hilarion's work was so good.⁴⁰

Nothing seems to have taken place between the date of this appraisal of Hilarion's work and April 1821 when, escaping the turbulent and charged atmosphere of Constantinople, brought about by the outbreak of the Greek Revolution, Oikonomos succeeded in fleeing to Odessa. There he preached at the funeral service of Patriarch Gregorios, whose body, after numerous misadventures, had been taken to Russia for burial.⁴¹

Later, Oikonomos made his way to St. Petersburg where he succeeded in gaining favour in official political and ecclesiastical circles.⁴² After meeting Prince Galitsyn, president of the Russian Bible Society, Oikonomos is said to have criticized Hilarion's translation, which the Russian Bible Society was considering for publication.⁴³ He further suggested that the Society use his own translation, unfortunately left behind in Constantinople. If recovery of it were impossible, he proposed that he be given the task to do a new one.⁴⁴

38. Vamvas, *Αντεπικρίσεις*, p. 36; see text on pp. 35–7. Cf. Siotes, *Οικονόμος*, p. 21.

39. Vamvas, *Αντεπικρίσεις*, p. 36.

40. Ibid.

41. C. Papadopoulos, *Ιστορία της Ἐκκλησίας της Ἑλλάδος. Τόμος Α'. Ὅροις καὶ ὀργάνωσις τῆς αὐτοκεφάλου ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Athens, 1920), p. 155. Hereafter cited as Papadopoulos, *Ιστορία*. S. S. Bairaktares, *Ὁ Πατριάρχης Γρηγόριος δ' Ἐ' καὶ ἡ μετὰφρασις τῆς Ἀγίας Γραφῆς* (Athens, 1965), pp. 3–5.

42. Made honorary member of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, Member of the Academy of Sciences, received numerous decorations and a pension. See Papadopoulos, *Ιστορία*, pp. 155–7.

43. Vamvas, *Αντεπικρίσεις*, p. 34; Samouel Kyriou, *Εισαγωγή*, p. 11.

44. Vamvas, *Αντεπικρίσεις*, p. 34.

This proposal was discussed by the Russian Bible Society, which asked Oikonomos to prepare a sample translation to be examined by Archbishop Philaret of Yaroslav (later Metropolitan of Moscow) and other ecclesiastical members of the committee. This Oikonomos did, but the matter did not proceed further, perhaps, as Vamvas suggests, because the committee was made aware of Oikonomos' original judgement of Hilarion's ability and quality of work. This was done by showing Prince Galitsyn Oikonomos' letter to Hilarion, sent through Leeves and Pinkerton to St. Petersburg. Hilarion, understandably, became incensed over Oikonomos' 'betrayal'.⁴⁵ In any event, Oikonomos' offer was not accepted.

Because of Oikonomos' very important role in the translation controversy that was to flare up in Greece almost two decades later, it is important here to review briefly Oikonomos' behaviour in Russia and his shift from being a partisan of the translated Scriptures to their most implacable opponent.

Those who have attempted to explain Oikonomos' behaviour in Russia and to justify his completely negative stand on the translation later, offer the rather tenuous explanation that Oikonomos believed Hilarion's version was to be a paraphrase and not strictly a translation.⁴⁶ Yet Oikonomos had been in Constantinople for at least a year before he fled the city and had ample opportunity to scrutinize Hilarion's work—if he so desired—because of his involvement in it and his influence at the Patriarchal see.⁴⁷ That he did not do so is evidence that while he remained in Constantinople he still favoured the concept of the translation and that nothing about Hilarion's work disturbed him. Also to be rejected is the contention that Oikonomos' reversal was due to his observation of the activities of Protestant missionaries in Smyrna before 1820.⁴⁸ This is an anachronism. The evidence, on the contrary, shows that

45. See his letter to Leeves in *ibid.*, pp. 37–8.

46. See Siotes, *Οικονόμος*, p. 21, who relies on Samouel Kypriou, *Εισαγωγή*, p. 1, but cf. Papadopoulos, *Ίστορία*, p. 153.

47. Created 'Catholic Preacher of the Ecumenical Patriarchate', later appointed 'Preacher and Teacher of the Ecumenical See and All Orthodox Churches'. *Ibid.*, pp. 152–4.

48. See Siotes, *Οικονόμος*, pp. 19, 21, 25, based on Papadopoulos, *Ίστορία*, p. 152. Neither cites any sources or offers any evidence.

Oikonomos was on friendly terms with Charles Williamson⁴⁹ and that the latter's activities as chaplain and Bible Society agent evoked no opposition or hostility on the part of Greek ecclesiastical or lay leaders.

Oikonomos' opposition to the translation must be attributed rather to a change that took place within himself. Beginning as a disciple of Koraes, he slowly moved away from his mentor's more liberal ideas until he found himself in the ultra-conservative camp. This change in Oikonomos can be noticed beginning in 1819 while he taught at the Philological Gymnasium of Smyrna, and from his support of Patriarch Gregorios' condemnation of western learning.⁵⁰ His rejection by the Russian Bible Society probably added a personal element, but his stay in Russia from 1821 to 1833 helped mould him into a true conservative.

It will be recalled that the Russian Bible Society came under severe criticism from the conservative elements of the Russian Church rather early. This criticism, led by Archimandrite Fotii and others, mounted until it brought about the suppression of the Society and finally its closure in 1826, under the arch-conservative emperor Nicholas I.⁵¹ It would not be pure conjecture, then, to say that this climate influenced Oikonomos' thinking and helped to shape his ideological position.

Turning our attention back to Constantinople, we note that on 13 December 1819 Patriarch Kyrillos VI resigned his office and retired. On the next day Gregorios V was elected to replace him. This was to be Gregorios' third and last re-election to the office of patriarch. Although Gregorios, as noted above, was opposed to the New Learning and was an indomitable foe of the ideas of the French Revolution, nevertheless he was a firm advocate of education, at least as he conceived it. Fortunately for the Bible Society, this included the translation of the Scriptures and its reading by ordinary folk in their spoken language.⁵²

49. See Papadopoulos, *Ιστορία*, p. 152.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

51. For the details, see Tompkins, *op. cit.*, 263, 267; Zacek, *op. cit.*, 428–32.

52. Patriarch Gregorios not only approved of Nikodemos the Hagiorites' translation of and commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul and the Catholic Epistles, but personally translated works of St. Basil and Chrysostom, and of the latter, those on the Scriptures. See Bairaktares, *Γρηγόριος Ε'*, pp. 3–5, and T. Th. Gritsopoulos, *Γρηγόριος Ε' ὁ Πατριάρχης τοῦ Ἑθνους*, *DIEE*, XIV (1960), 182–84.

Consequently, when Pinkerton, who had undertaken a tour of the eastern Mediterranean for the Bible Society,⁵³ arrived in Constantinople in October 1819, he visited Patriarch Gregorios with the purpose of securing the approval of the Ecumenical Patriarchate for the translation of the entire Bible, and for having it printed on the Patriarchal Press.⁵⁴ The change in patriarchs may have also influenced him in wishing to get an agreement with the consent of more than just the person of the patriarch.

After several deliberations with the Patriarch and his aides, articles of agreement were drawn up and approved by Patriarch Gregorios, Patriarch Prokopios of Jerusalem (in residence in Constantinople), Archbishop of Sinai Konstantios, Prince Skarlatos Kallimaches, and Prince Ioannes Kallimaches, in addition to lay officials of the Patriarchate.⁵⁵

According to Pinkerton's report, 'the Patriarch Gregory gave them [the Scriptures] his unqualified approbation and promised to do everything in his power to see the work completed according to the principle laid down in [the] ten articles'.⁵⁶

The ten articles of agreement cited by Pinkerton have not been published in their entirety. Nevertheless, it is possible to

53. It is important to note that while on this tour, Pinkerton succeeded in establishing local Bible Society chapters in Corfu, Zakynthos, Cephallenia, and Athens. In Corfu, Baron Emmanuel Theotokes was nominated president by Metropolitan Makarios, while in the other three chapters, the respective metropolitans became presidents. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16 (1820)*, pp. 9, 11, 12, 14; *Report No. 17 (1821)*, pp. liv–lv. This puts to rest the allegation that there was widespread opposition to both the Society and the translation at this time.

54. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16 (1820)*, p. 18. The critics of the translation make much out of the fact that Pinkerton arrived in Constantinople with letters of recommendation from Prince Galitsyn addressed to the Russian ambassador and to the Greek and Armenian patriarchs. See Siotes, *Οικονόμος*, p. 23, and Samouel Kypriou, *Εισαγωγή*, p. xxv. The details are from Vamvas' *Αντεπίκρισις*, p. 33. It should be pointed out that that was and still is to some extent the only way to get anything done in that part of the world.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 11. See also Vamvas, *Αντεπίκρισις*, p. 33, and Papadopoulos, *Ιστορία*, p. 153. Skarlatos Kallimaches served as Hospodar of both Wallachia (1821) and Moldavia (1807–10; 1812–19), while his brother served as Dragoman of the Porte (1819–21). See D. Zakythenos, *Ἡ Τουρκοκρατία: Εισαγωγή εἰς τὴν νεωτέραν ἱστορίαν τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ* (Athens, 1957), pp. 100–1.

56. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16 (1820)*, pp. 18, 25.

ascertain the most important provisions from Hilarion's *Ekthesis* (Report)⁵⁷ and Neophytos Vamvas' *Antepikrisis*.

These were:⁵⁸

1. That the translation should, as much as possible, be made accurately, word for word, with a strict attention to give the exact force of each expression.

2. That, as soon as each of the translations was finished, it should be submitted to the criticism of some of our learned prelates; that he [*sic*] might peruse it carefully, and correct any oversight that might be found in it; and that, when a testimonial was given by him to the Holy Synod of the correctness of the translation, a permission, in writing, should be given by the Patriarch for its publication, which permission should be printed with it.

3. That the publication should take place at the National Printing Press, in the Patriarchate, under the eye of the church, myself and other learned men superintending the correction of the errors of the press.

4. That the copies to be published should be ten thousand in number, of which a part should have the Greek text in parallel columns, and the remainder the translation alone, according to the agreement then made with Mr. Alexander Argyramos.

In addition, the agreement placed the chief responsibility for the translation of the New and Old Testament (the latter based on the text of the Septuagint) on Hilarion, with Archbishop Konstantios of Sinai and Metropolitan Matthew of Thessalonike acting as reviewers. The paper (from Paris), the ink and type (from London) were to be furnished by the Bible Society.⁵⁹

Although not part of the original agreement, Hilarion, who, according to Pinkerton, had three years of work before him, was provided with two assistants, one of whom was Konstantinos

57. Extracts from Hilarion's *Report* were published as 'Extracts of a Greek letter from Hilarion . . .' in B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), pp. 152–8, not without some editing.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 153.

59. See Vamvas, '*Αντεπίκρισις*', pp. 33–4; B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 153; Halke MS. No. 192, p. 41; Sphyroeras, '*Ἰλαρίων*', p. 270.

Vardalachos, a teacher in the Greek School in Bucharest. With Alexander Argyramos, chief printer of the Patriarchal Press, a separate agreement was entered into by Pinkerton. Their contract called for ten thousand copies of the Scriptures, divided into five thousand New Testaments, three thousand diglot Bibles, and two thousand in translation alone.⁶⁰

To confirm the entire project, Patriarch Gregorios issued a letter of approval. This read as follows:

Inasmuch as the translation of the Sacred Scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments in our simple and easily comprehensible idiom was approved even by our All-Holy and Most Reverend predecessor as can be well-ascertained both from the permission granted for its reading in the spoken language and its publication by printing. Our humility also, for the sake of this [and] for the spiritual benefit of our people and the building up of our blameless faith, grants permission to any pious, divinely inspired, and worthy individual, who is capable of an accurate and sound translation of the Old and New Testaments, to translate the text without innovation and without adulteration into the language in use for the easier comprehension and spiritual benefit of our people who read, and to publish [the translation] after having submitted it beforehand to ecclesiastical scrutiny, revision and approval. For this purpose, we issue our present letter of approbation in the year 1820, in the month of April.⁶¹

Pinkerton, however, was interested in more than just the Greek translation. He asked Patriarch Gregorios for assistance in securing a translator for an Albanian⁶² and Bulgarian New

60. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 19.

61. Text in Samouel Kypriou, *Εισαγωγή*, pp. xxvii–xxix. An English translation in the English version of Siotes' *Οικονόμος*, p. 24, note 19. Siotes, following Oikonomos ('Επιτερισις, p. 305), sees reservations in the letter where none exist. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

62. In addition to the many inhabitants of 'Illyria' who spoke Albanian, Pinkerton sought the translation for the people of Poros, Spetsai, and Hydra, whom he discovered to be Albanians and not Greeks. In fact, Pinkerton estimated that one-third of Athens and much of Attica also spoke Albanian. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16* (1820), p. 15. For the Albanian translation see Eulogios

Testament, as well as someone to transcribe the Turkish New Testament into Greek characters.⁶³ In response to this new request, Patriarch Gregorios approved the appointment of his chief Turkish secretary to transcribe the Turkish text⁶⁴ and wrote a letter to Ioannikios, Metropolitan of Tirnovo (1818–21) urging him to find a suitable clergyman to do the Bulgarian translation. At the same time Gregorios nominated Archimandrite Theodosios of the Monastery of Bistrista in Rumania as the person best qualified, in his opinion, for the work.⁶⁵

With his mission completed in Constantinople, Pinkerton, accompanied by Hilarion and Alexander Argyramos, visited Patriarch Gregorios to bid him farewell. During this meeting, Pinkerton reports that the patriarch again reiterated his approval of the contract drawn up with Hilarion, and expressed himself as being very pleased with the entire arrangement. In fact, Gregorios gave Pinkerton a letter addressed to Baron Emmanuel Theotokes in Corfu, in which he gave both his approval of and blessing to the Ionian Bible Society.⁶⁶ Present at this meeting was Metropolitan Ioannes of Caesaria (1817–23) who, according to Pinkerton, also expressed enthusiasm over the work of the Society among the Orthodox.

Upon leaving, Pinkerton received the patriarch's blessings and heard him express the hope that 'the blessings of the Most High might rest on all . . . [the Society's] undertakings, which were likely to prove so conducive to the glory of God, and in the best interest of the nations for whom they are intended'.⁶⁷

Needless to say, Pinkerton left Constantinople—on his way to Odessa—elated and filled with great happiness over the overwhelming support given to the translation project by Patriarch Gregorios.⁶⁸

Kourilas, *Γρηγόριος ὁ Ἀργυροκαστήτης, Θεολογία*, VIII (1930), 59–71, 110–11, 253–5.

63. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16 (1820)*, p. 23.

64. *Ibid.*, pp. 23, 25.

65. *Ibid.*, p. 25. See also J. F. Clarke, 'The Russian Bible Society and the Bulgarians', *Harvard Slavic Studies*, III (1957), 69, 81.

66. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16 (1820)*, p. 25; Kourilas, *Θεολογία*, VIII (1930), 66.

67. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16 (1820)*, p. 25.

68. See his remarks, *ibid.*, p. 26.

The patriarch's enthusiastic interest in not only the modern Greek translation but an Albanian, Bulgarian, and Turkish one, as amply proved by the official records of the British and Foreign Bible Society, published before the patriarch's death and before the traditionalist reaction manifested itself, belies those who support the theory that Gregorios was either pressured or duped into giving his consent. Unless one is willing to admit that the Society's agent reported nothing but lies, and that the patriarch's attitude and actions are creations of Pinkerton's imagination, one must admit the evidence and accept the conclusion that Gregorios was a sincere advocate of the translation.

Among contemporary Greek scholars, Markos Siotes, who uses the *Reports* of the B.F.B.S., but stops with the early volumes, cannot detach himself from the position that no true Orthodox Patriarch of the Church of Constantinople ever *truly* consented to a translation of the Scriptures. Hence, the need to demonstrate, despite the evidence to the contrary, that Gregorios was forced to approve the translation,⁶⁹ that his approval was filled with reservations, and finally, even if we were to admit that the above was not so, that his acceptance of the translation was a private and personal matter and not binding upon the Church.⁷⁰

For all this, Siotes relies upon the weighted testimony of Matthew of Kyzikos,⁷¹ Samuel Kypriou,⁷² and Konstantinos Oikonomos,⁷³ all involved in the controversy and fierce opponents of the translation. A much more objective evaluation was given by both Tasos Gritsopoulos⁷⁴ and Stylianos Bairaktares,⁷⁵ who although they do not use the evidence of the B.F.B.S. *Reports*, support the view that Gregorios' advocacy of the translation was consistent with his general views on education.

With Pinkerton's departure from Constantinople, the Society sent the Revd. Henry Leves to that city—with the prior

69. Siotes, *Οικονόμος*, pp. 21, 22, 23.

70. *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 22–3.

71. *Ἀντίρρησις*, p. 13.

72. *Εἰσαγωγή*, pp. xxviii–xxix.

73. *Ἐπίκρισις*, p. 305.

74. *DIEE*, XIV (1960), 182, n. 2.

75. *Γρηγόριος Ε'*, p. 5.

agreement of the Patriarchate⁷⁶—to act as coordinator and expeditor of the project. But Leeves did more than assume direction, for he knew modern Greek, as did Williamson, and both assisted in the revision of the translated text after both Hilarion and Archbishop Konstantios had done their part.⁷⁷ After Williamson's death, Benjamin Barker was taken on to replace him.

According to Leeves, Hilarion proved willing to make alterations in his text. These were made 'to cut off excrescences and to make the translation as terse and as close to the original as possible'.⁷⁸

Reporting to the Society on 8 February 1821, Leeves stated that 'the types for the first page of St. Matthew were beginning to be set up in a few days. I hope the first sheet will be struck off.'⁷⁹ The work could not have proceeded very far beyond this point, for Hypselantes' revolt broke out in Moldavia, followed by an even more significant and consequential uprising in the Morea.

The outbreak and subsequent course of the Greek Revolution significantly affected the history of the Greek people. What has not been adequately noted is its direct effect on the translation of the Bible and even on the 'language question', two significant problems still awaiting their solution. Had the beginning of the Greek Revolution and of the printing of the New Testament not coincided, it is reasonable to assume that the printing would have been completed and, given the active support of Patriarch Gregorios V, the translation distributed among the Greeks throughout the Ottoman Empire. The active sponsorship of the translated Scriptures would have placed the Church on the side of those supporting the use of the spoken language and would have contributed greatly, if not to the elimination of the 'language question', at least to its reduction to a minor issue.

However, the two events did coincide and on Easter Sunday, 10 April 1821, Patriarch Gregorios, together with a number of hierarchs and many lay leaders of the Greek people in Constantinople and elsewhere in the empire were executed by the Ottoman government both as accomplices and as examples

76. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 16 (1820)*, p. 26.

77. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 17 (1821)*, pp. liv–lv.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 66.

79. *Ibid.*

for the 'perfidy' of the Greeks. The fear and anxiety which gripped the Greek population of the capital—a fear shared even by other Europeans in the city during the early days of the Greek Revolution—made work impossible.

Leeves, anxious for the manuscript, was able to secure it from Hilarion, who was in seclusion with Archbishop Konstantios on the Island of Halke, through the British Ambassador, Lord Stratford.⁸⁰

Although Constantinople remained tense for some time because the Turkish government did not disarm the Turkish populace—provided with arms at the outbreak of the Greek revolt—conditions did quiet down sufficiently for Hilarion to resume work on the translation. This work continued even after June of the same year, when Hilarion was elected and consecrated Metropolitan of Tirnovo, Bulgaria.⁸¹

The question, however, of using the Patriarchal Press began to recede in Leeves' mind, for, he felt, the 'Greek nation had suffered too many blows'.⁸² Nevertheless, he still remained hopeful, though by the end of the year some thought was given to having the printing done in Paris or Moscow.⁸³ Hilarion, however, objected to the suggestion that the printing be done in Moscow because 'any appearance of communication with Russia would be fatal to the *rayah*'.⁸⁴

The situation with the Patriarchal Press did not substantially change even by June of 1822, when Leeves visited the press and its director Alexander Argyramos. It was found that, although the press had suffered damage in its outer rooms when the Turks had broken into the Patriarchate in April 1821, the machinery itself—housed in an inner chamber—was not materially affected and that the type had remained undamaged.⁸⁵ What Leeves perhaps did not know at the time was that the question of restoring the Patriarchal Press was being discussed at the Patriarchate. It seems, from Hilarion's *Ekthesis*, that there were

80. According to Leeves, both Hilarion and Konstantios witnessed the execution of Patriarch Gregorios V. See B.F.B.S., No. 18 (1822), p. 47.

81. Ibid., p. 49, see also Sardeon Germanos, *Ἐπισκοπικοί Κατάλογοι Βορείου Θράκης, Θρακικά*, VIII (1937), 182.

82. B.F.B.S., Report No. 18 (1822), p. 47.

83. Ibid., p. 43.

84. Quoted by J. F. Clarke, *American Missionaries*, p. 137.

85. B.F.B.S., Report No. 19 (1823), pp. 93–4.

members who advocated the complete dismantling of the printing facilities. Hilarion tried to emphasize to the members of the Synod not only the value of the press for the Patriarchate, but also that it could be a profitable enterprise with the printing of the translated Scriptures.⁸⁶

On 27 July 1822, Patriarch Eugenios II died, ending a fifteen-month term of office filled with many dramatic and bloody events.⁸⁷ On that same day, the Ottoman government issued an order permitting the free election of a new patriarch. It read as follows:

To all the great and small of the Roman Nation.⁸⁸

Because of the death of the present patriarch, it is necessary to appoint in his place a patriarch who will be able always—after the investigation and examination of the good and bad state of his nation—to furnish advice to those who have need, and to report those unwilling to accept it to the Sublime Government, [and] one who will show loyalty to the Sublime Sultanate without allowing his nation, now or in the future, to fall into grave dangers.

For these reasons you should elect as patriarch whomever among you will be always able to enforce upon his nation the execution of their religious duties; to serve the Sublime Government now and in the future with faith and uprightness, refraining from every dishonourable and treacherous act. . . .⁸⁹

These instructions are important to our subject because they dramatically reflect the continued tense situation at the

86. See Halke MS. No. 192, pp. 1–5; Sphyroeras, *Ήλιων*, pp. 252–3.

87. Sardeon Germanos, *Συμβολή εἰς τοὺς κατρίαρχικοὺς καταλόγους* (2 vols.; Constantinople, 1935–8), II, 161–2. The majority of high-ranking Greek lay and ecclesiastical figures were executed during Eugenios' reign. See D. A. Kokkinos, *Ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐπανάστασις* (10 vols.; 3rd ed., Athens, 1956), I, 369–99, and N. Moschopoulos, *Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐπαναστάσεως κατὰ τοὺς Τούρκους ἱστοριογράφους ἐν ἀντιπαράθεσιν πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἱστορικοὺς* (Athens, 1960), pp. 150–5, 181–6.

88. The Turks always referred to the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire as Rum or Romans, a legacy of the Byzantine Empire.

89. Germanos, *Συμβολή*, II, 161–2.

Patriarchate and signal a return to traditionalist policies as an effort to restore the *status quo ante*, as it existed before April 1821. Equally significant is the fact that a vast majority of Greeks continued to live within the Ottoman Empire and that the Patriarch remained legally responsible for their good conduct as well as his own.

Not unrelated to this is the subject of British philhellenism and its support of the Greek cause. The Bible Society too was British and prudence then would require an official termination of all relationships with bodies based outside the Ottoman Empire.

These factors help explain why Eugenios' successor, Anthimos III (1822–4),⁹⁰ released from a seven-month imprisonment to assume the patriarchal dignity, refused to confirm Patriarch Gregorios' approbation of the translation, even though as Metropolitan of Smyrna (1797–1821), he had been a warm supporter of both the translation and the Bible Society.⁹¹ The Patriarch's reversal on the question of the translation signalled the beginning of a reaction opposed to proceeding with the entire project.

Unfortunately, the minutes of the various meetings of the Patriarchal Synod which met to discuss Hilarion's translation are no longer extant. What information we have comes from the prejudicial pen of Metropolitan Matthew of Kyzikos. This is the same Matthew who was appointed by the Synod as a reviewer of Hilarion's translation. Apparently, sensing the change in the official position of the Synod, Matthew also changed his personal views on the translation, and, in fact, became the chief spokesman for the dissenters.⁹²

Learning of the growing opposition to the translation and to the restoration of the patriarchal printing facility—information derived from Archbishop Konstantios—Hilarion, from his see in Tirnovo, addressed an *Ekthesis* (Report), dated 20 August 1822, to Patriarch Anthimos and the Holy Synod.

Hilarion's *Ekthesis*, however, received little attention from the

90. Ibid., p. 208. For a rather negative portrait of Anthimos, see M. I. Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικής ιστορίας μνημεία: Α' Γρηγορίου Ε' διδάδοχοι* (Athens, 1922), pp. 7–11.

91. Ibid., p. 10.

92. Matthew of Kyzikos, *Ἀντίρρησις*, pp. 37–8.

members of the Synod. We learn from Matthew of Kyzikos that it was 'too long' to be read at a synodal meeting and that it was given to him to study and to answer.⁹³ Matthew further informs us how 'surprised and saddened' he became when he read Hilarion's views concerning the translation of the Scriptures. Only his 'great respect and love' for Hilarion, he added, kept him from making public the 'corrupt' ideas of the *Ekthesis*. 'Concerned' for Hilarion's 'reputation', and his own desire to keep the 'scandal' secret, Matthew wrote privately to Hilarion, informing him of the Synod's opposition to the translation and his own refusal to participate in it any longer.⁹⁴

Unashamedly, Matthew also assumed the role of professor by recalling the history and the fate of the translation of Maximos Kallipolites. Finally he informed Hilarion that the Synod was meeting not to deliberate the merits of his translation, but whether 'the Scriptures should be indifferently offered to the vulgar and uneducated [people], unable to scientifically investigate God's revelation without the guidance and faultless interpretation of the Fathers'.⁹⁵

It is probable that Hilarion anticipated the kind of discussion that would take place in the Synod. Hence, his 'lengthy' *Ekthesis* in which he defended a view shared by all who had or would advocate the translation of the Scriptures: the need for a translation as a necessary means by which the Greek people could learn their faith and raise their educational and moral standards.⁹⁶

After relating the now known events leading to the agreement between Patriarch Gregorios and the Bible Society to prove that the translation was not a personal undertaking, Hilarion declared it not to be an innovation, but something that the Orthodox Church had permitted numerous times.⁹⁷ And since he believed that the 'common tongue [was] to the people a different one from the Hellenic',⁹⁸ the modern Greek trans-

93. Ibid., p. 2.

94. Ibid., p. 3.

95. Ibid., p. 38.

96. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 152; Halke MS. No. 192, pp. 4–5; Sphyroeras, *Ἱαπτόων*, pp. 253–5.

97. He cites the Latin, Arabic, Persian, Slavic, and Greek translation of the Bible, and the fact that no dispute ever arose over these translations. Ibid., pp. 266–7 and especially p. 296; B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 156.

98. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 158; Halke MS. No. 192, p. 11; Sphyroeras, *Ἱαπτόων*, p. 267.

lation fell into the same category as the translations in other languages.

Hilarion went on to caution the members of the Synod against submitting to the prejudices of the monks of Mt. Athos, who were opposed to any translation, primarily because of their stand: 'move not the external boundaries which thy fathers have fixed'.⁹⁹ Some of the monks, he exclaimed with disbelief, 'go as far as to call it [the translation] the most terrible of all heresies'.¹⁰⁰ These monks of Athos, who were the principal confessors of his flock in Bulgaria, were also responsible, according to Hilarion, for teaching the people many things as Scriptural commandments when in fact they were illiterate with regard to the Bible and only skilled in making money.¹⁰¹

Coming close to arguing that the basis of the entire Christian faith is contained in the Scriptures, Hilarion challenged the authority and the centrality in the life of many Greeks of what he considered to be a distorted, unwritten tradition. He believed this tradition responsible, due to the lack of printing, for transmitting many false notions resulting in schism, ignorance, and superstition. Many deviations from the faith, he suggested, were due to ignorance of the Scriptures. Hence a translation, which would make the faith known accurately, would safeguard 'the doctrinal and moral notions of the Scriptures'.¹⁰²

Hilarion was not particularly disturbed if in translation the Scriptures lost 'somewhat of the grace of sublimity of their phrase', as some opponents had contended. 'And if it be so', he added, 'our sacred pulpit is not the rostrum of Demosthenes or Libanius, but the school of fishermen . . .'.¹⁰³

He rejected outright the notion that the Scriptures could

99. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23 (1827)*, p. 155; Halke MS. No. 192, p. 19; Sphyroeras, *Ἰλαρίων*, pp. 261–2.

100. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23 (1827)*, p. 155; Halke MS. No. 192, p. 19; Sphyroeras, *Ἰλαρίων*, p. 262.

101. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23 (1827)*, p. 158; Halke MS. No. 192, p. 27; Sphyroeras, *Ἰλαρίων*, p. 266.

102. Halke MS. No. 192, pp. 21–22, 23; Sphyroeras, *Ἰλαρίων*, pp. 263–6. How accurately the faith could be safeguarded in translation, Hilarion attempted to prove by comparing John 21:15 in the original Greek with a Latin and French translation, and the same text in modern Greek with the same Latin and French versions.

103. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23 (1827)*, p. 154; Halke MS. No. 192, p. 16; Sphyroeras, *Ἰλαρίων*, p. 260.

become comprehensible in the original simply by frequent readings, or that the spoken language was not capable of rendering the text. The first idea was considered by Hilarion as an exercise in self-delusion, while he viewed the second as equally erroneous, for he was convinced that the spoken language possessed the appropriate words to render the Scriptures properly.¹⁰⁴

To Hilarion, all views opposing the translation were views contrary to God's will, for, in his mind, it was teaching that served as the basis of the Christian faith. In the past, the teaching had been done through the use of an intelligible Bible, and so it had to be in his time, for the absence of such a Bible meant that 'the Lord was silent'.¹⁰⁵

But neither Hilarion's arguments, nor the spirited defence of the translation rendered by Archbishop Konstantios and Metropolitan Chrysanthos of Serres before the Synod, were sufficiently convincing to prevent that body from rejecting Hilarion's translation in 1823 as a 'faulty and useless innovation made for other more secret motives'.¹⁰⁶

Hilarion, however, was not prepared to accept defeat so easily. He prepared a thirty-one-page *Apologia* on 5 March 1824,¹⁰⁷ which he sent to Matthew of Kyzikos. Shortly afterwards Hilarion also wrote a letter to Patriarch Anthimos in which he accused Matthew of misrepresenting his views. The patriarch did not reply, but appointed Matthew to respond in writing to both Hilarion's *Ekthesis* and *Apologia*.

Matthew's answer can be found in his *Antirresis*, which was written in the same year as Hilarion's *Apologia*, and which represented his personal reply as well as the Synod's views on the subject of the translation.¹⁰⁸

Matthew's treatise is really a long-winded oration, often blistering with irony, sophistry, sarcasm, and vituperation directed personally against Hilarion as well as against the translation.

104. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 154; Halke MS. No. 192, pp. 10–11; Sphyroeras, *Ἰλαπῶν*, p. 257.

105. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 158; Halke MS. No. 92, p. 28; Sphyroeras, *Ἰλαπῶν*, p. 267.

106. See Matthew of Kyzikos, *Ἀντίρρησις*, p. 23.

107. See Halke MS. No. 192, pp. 38–68; Sphyroeras, *Ἰλαπῶν*, 271–301.

108. Samouel Kypriou, *Εἰσαγωγή*, p. xli.

Because of Hilarion's defence of the translation, Matthew accused him of attempting to substitute corrupt and heretical ideas for Orthodox ones,¹⁰⁹ of being ignorant of the Holy Scriptures, an incompetent translator, and a persecutor of the Church.¹¹⁰ Hilarion was further accused of committing blasphemy when he attempted to lay the responsibility for the ignorance of the Greeks upon their 'political' and ecclesiastical leadership.¹¹¹

Equally blasphemous for Matthew was Hilarion's praise of the unselfish work of the Protestants, and the idea that the Greeks had fallen to such a low state that they needed outside assistance.¹¹² For Matthew the Church had all the learning and books that it needed; it was self-sufficient. Therefore, equally unacceptable was the idea that patristic commentaries were actually introduced as an attempt to bring back people who had drawn away from the Church and the Bible, due to their inability to understand the latter.¹¹³ Finally, Matthew simply scoffed at the suggestion that only a few Greeks, clergymen or laymen, knew anything about the Scriptures and that the way to correct this was through a translation.¹¹⁴

Turning to the translation itself and to Hilarion's part in it, Matthew was equally uncharitable. He refused to accept as true Hilarion's account of how the translation came to be, and the roles of Patriarch Kyrillos VI and Gregorios V, because the events were not recorded in the patriarchal codices.¹¹⁵ But even

109. Matthew of Kyzikos, *'Αντίρρησις*, pp. 2, 128; cf. Samouel Kypriou, *Εισαγωγή*, pp. ii–iii.

110. Matthew of Kyzikos, *'Αντίρρησις*, p. 5.

111. Ibid., pp. 10, 38, 40. Hilarion had said: 'Have we (I, your Eminence, or any of the other bishops) truly examined all that the God-fearing Fathers have taught concerning theology, and taught this to [our] Christians? I doubt that this has ever taken place.' Halke MS. No. 192, p. 47; Sphyroeras, *'Ιλαρίων*, p. 280.

112. Matthew of Kyzikos, *'Αντίρρησις* p. 10; cf. Hilarion's letter in B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23 (1827)*, pp. 153, 157, 158.

113. Matthew of Kyzikos, *'Αντίρρησις*, p. 95.

114. Ibid., pp. 44, 105; cf. Halke MS. No. 192, pp. 5, 26, 228–9; Sphyroeras, *'Ιλαρίων*, pp. 254, 260–1, 266; and B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23 (1827)*, pp. 152, 157, 158.

115. Matthew of Kyzikos, *'Αντίρρησις*, p. 12; cf. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23 (1827)*, p. 153. The absence of a record among the archives of the Patriarchate is in itself, of course, no proof of permission not having been granted to

if they had been, and the patriarchs in question had approved, the Church would not be bound, Matthew argued, by their judgements without additional examination. He reminded Hilarion that the Church had often condemned patriarchs in the past for their actions.¹¹⁶

The fact that the translation was initiated by 'Lutherans' proved to Matthew that the entire project was 'Lutheran'. In truth, he contended, the translation was a trap, a plot of the Lutherans who wanted to use it to convert the Orthodox.¹¹⁷

But this was not all. Matthew rejected the translation because to him the Bible was a book filled with hidden doctrinal teachings¹¹⁸ that could only be read with patristic guidance.¹¹⁹ And since the Orthodox Church abounded with scriptural guides and interpreters,¹²⁰ the translation was not only without benefit, it was actually harmful.¹²¹

Matthew, moreover, was unmoved by Hilarion's argument that the people did not understand the Scriptures because of the language in which they were written. He insisted that the fault lay not in the 'ancient' language, but in the people themselves. Would they have understood, he asked rhetorically, Plato or Aristotle without a teacher if they had been simply translated

Hilarion, for often documents were not immediately recorded and later some were lost, taken, or stolen. In addition, many patriarchs, upon leaving the patriarchal office, took with them the documents of their reign. Fires, too, contributed to losses. On the condition of the archives, see G. Arampatzoglou, *Φωτίειος Βιβλιοθήκη, ἥτοι ἐπίσημα καὶ ἰδιωτικά ἔγγραφα καὶ ἄλλα μνημεῖα σχετικά πρὸς τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου μετὰ γενικῶν καὶ ἐδικῶν προλεγομένων* (2 vols.; Constantinople, 1933–5), I, vi–xiv, and K. Delikanis, *Τὰ ἐν τοῖς κώδιξι τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ ἀρχιεπισκοπικοῦ σωζόμενα ἐπίσημα ἐκκλησιαστικά ἔγγραφα τὰ ἀφορῶντα εἰς τὰς σχέσεις τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου πρὸς τὰς Ἐκκλησίας Ρωσσίας, Βλαχίας, καὶ Μολδαβίας, Σερβίας Ἀχριδῶν καὶ Πεκίου 1564–1863 οἷς προστίθεται ἱστορικὴ μελέτη περὶ τῆς Ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Ἀχριδῶν* (Constantinople, 1904), pp. ii, xxix–xxviii.

116. Matthew of Kyzikos, *Ἀντίρρησις*, pp. 13, 14.

117. Ibid., p. 132; cf. Samouel Kyprίου, *Εἰσαγωγή*, p. ix.

118. Matthew of Kyzikos, *Ἀντίρρησις*, p. 57.

119. Ibid., p. 43. This was still the view of learned faculty of the School of Theology of the University of Athens in 1901. See their *Ἡ μετὰφρασις τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, Ὑπόμνημα τῆς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς πρὸς τὴν Ἱερὰν Σύνοδον* (Athens, 1901), pp. 3–4.

120. Matthew of Kyzikos, *Ἀντίρρησις*, p. 126.

121. Ibid., p. 43.

into the vulgar language? How, then, could they understand the Gospels, which contained heavenly wisdom, when human wisdom was beyond their comprehension?¹²²

When Hilarion argued that Christ taught the common people in village squares as well as the learned in synagogues, and that the common people understood him,¹²³ Matthew retorted that not only had the vulgar people then not understood him (in fact, the 'mob' followed Christ only because of his miracles), but even the learned of that time failed to comprehend him. If the Apostles did not understand him, how could the Jewish mobs hope to do so?¹²⁴

When Hilarion took Matthew to task for his low opinion of the common people, the latter replied by saying:

In what have we erred when we say the vulgar and illiterate did not understand the entire Bible even in the past. In fact, it would be an error if I said the opposite, that is, that the vulgar and illiterate did understand. This would be a grave error and a grave sin, since we would be stating something contradictory and something proven false, foolish, and insulting to the Holy Scriptures, and contradictory to the entire Orthodox teaching.¹²⁵

The New Testament, according to Matthew, was only slightly more clear than the Old. It too required a special grace to be understood and special intermediaries to be transmitted. Matthew insisted that the Scriptures were not given to everyone indiscriminately, but to a chosen few. Proof that this was so was evidenced by the fact that the Law was given to Moses and not directly to the people. In fact, Moses often taught, according to Matthew, not directly, but through the Levites and the priests.¹²⁶ In the New Testament, he noted that the Good Samaritan gave two coins (i.e. the Old and New Testaments), not to the man

122. Ibid., pp. 44–5.

123. Ibid., p. 45; Halke MS. No. 192, p. 42; Sphyroeras, *Ἰλαρίων*, p. 277.

124. Matthew of Kyzikos, *Ἀντίρρησις*, p. 50.

125. Ibid., p. 104. Matthew was horrified by the possibility of people taking certain passages of the Old Testament literally, especially those that speak of God having hands, feet, or walking and talking, and expressing passions and feelings; *ibid.*, p. 115.

126. Ibid., p. 119.

who fell among the thieves, but to an intermediary—the innkeeper.¹²⁷

It is difficult to deny that Matthew argued with some conviction—although not always honestly—or that his views are representative of a traditionalist, obscurantist, and protectionist position, which basically refused to permit the intrusion of any perceptible change from the accepted norm, fearing that the entire edifice would collapse if any changes were permitted. Yet one wonders: if his theological convictions were so strong, how was it that he had accepted at one time to work on the translation? One is not entirely convinced by his explanation of consenting merely to avoid saddening Hilarion. And what of his statement that he was forced by the Synod to resume work on the translation after his release from prison? He had argued previously that the translation was the personal affair of Hilarion and that the Synod had nothing to do with it.

One is forced to conclude that theology, as important as it may very well have been, was only one part of the story, and that non-theological factors also played their part. 'It is not to the advantage of the Church', Matthew declared, 'either politically or ecclesiastically to accept the publication of this translation from the Patriarchal Press, nor to issue a synodal letter so that it might be printed elsewhere.'¹²⁸

What these political or even ecclesiastical disadvantages for the Church were, Matthew never tells us, although he stated that they were already known to the hierarchs he was addressing. In any event, what we do get is a lot of bad theologizing.

The time, however, for discussion and debate was about to be closed. On 20 June 1824, Hilarion received an official communication from Patriarch Anthimos. It read:

We together with the holy brotherhood [the patriarchal synod] have come to realize, after due deliberation, that your exchanges over the translation—executed by your Reverence—would result in disputations and indeed controversy over doctrinal matters of Holy Scriptures. This is not only unacceptable to the Church, it is to be entirely avoided as unprofitable in such unsuitable times.¹²⁹

127. Ibid., p. 122.

128. Ibid., p. 2.

129. Gedeon, *Μνημεῖα*, p. 38.

The patriarchal letter went on to advise Hilarion to drop the entire matter of the translation because it was a question equally 'unprofitable for the ecclesiastical situation and the political circumstances'.¹³⁰

Less than three months following his letter to Hilarion, Patriarch Anthimos was expelled from office,¹³¹ accused of being in sympathy with the movement for Serb independence. His place was filled on 9 September 1824, by Chrysanthos I (1824–6), the Metropolitan of Serres.¹³²

Chrysanthos' elevation to the patriarchal dignity must have lifted the spirits of both Hilarion and Leeves, for the new patriarch had been a warm supporter and an able advocate of the translation. But to Leeves' surprise and disappointment, Chrysanthos refused to sanction the translation or to have it printed on the Patriarchal Press when he was asked to do so during a visitation. Reminded of his former zeal and support of both the translation and the Bible Society, Chrysanthos was reported to have given a truly Phanariot answer: 'Then I was Metropolitan of Serres, now I am the Ecumenical Patriarch'.¹³³

Neither this latest setback nor the previous synodal decisions caused Hilarion or his collaborators to cease their translating labours. In a report dated 26 March 1825, Leeves informed the Bible Society that Hilarion had travelled to Constantinople in order to revise the translation of the Old Testament.¹³⁴ While in the city, he agreed to the plan that the printing should be executed in London, and suggested great care to avoid all possible errors. Leeves, too, joined in this plea, recommending that no corrections be made except for obvious oversights. Later, on receiving news that the Bible Society had agreed to proceed with the printing of the New Testament, Leeves asked Hilarion to draw up the title page.¹³⁵

130. Ibid.

131. Germanos, *Συμβολή*, II, 164–5.

132. Gedeon, *Μνημεῖα*, p. 11; Germanos, *Συμβολή*, II, 165–7.

133. Gedeon, *Μνημεῖα*, p. 12.

134. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 22 (1826)*, p. 98. J. F. Clarke (*American Missionaries*, p. 139) believed that Hilarion almost became patriarch while in Constantinople, but was unsuccessful and had to return to his see.

135. Despite the Patriarchate's unequivocal position on the translation, it does not appear that the decisions of 1823 or 1824 were published or widely circulated. In fact, Matthew's refutation was not published until 1841, and then primarily as a reaction to the new situation in Greece.

In response to patriarchal opposition, Hilarion's attitude and disregard for the Patriarchate's negative stand apparently was shared by many others as well.¹³⁶ In 1825 seven thousand copies of the Scriptures were sold among the Greeks, Armenians, and Jews in Constantinople, while the Patriarch of Antioch, Methodios (1823–50),¹³⁷ not only received them with joy, but gave permission for one of his priests to distribute them. Patriarch Methodios also requested one hundred copies in Arabic. The same was repeated in Jerusalem.¹³⁸

Nor was the situation any different in the sees of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In Adrianople, the Society's agent, Benjamin Barker, was welcomed by the Metropolitan¹³⁹ as he was in Thessalonike, Serres, Drama,¹⁴⁰ Philippopolis (Plovdiv), and Magnesia by their respective hierarchs as late as 9 May 1827.¹⁴¹ Even at the Patriarchate itself, Leeves and Argyrarnes were busy with the revision of the Turkish Psalms in Greek characters to be printed at the Patriarchal Press for the Greek Orthodox of the interior of Asia Minor.¹⁴² Archbishop Konstantios, too, elected Patriarch of Constantinople in 1830, was still at work on the revision of Hilarion's Old Testament text as late as 3 October 1826.¹⁴³

Hilarion, however, was soon to become disenchanted with the Bible Society. His translated text of the New Testament was returned from England with 'fifty-four folio sheets of criticism and the suggestion that [he] allow his manuscript to be revised in London'.¹⁴⁴ These criticisms, primarily stylistic and grammatical, were rejected by Hilarion, who demanded that the Society honour its agreement with him and print his text without any revisions. He even threatened to expose the Society

136. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 22* (1826), pp. 98–9.

137. V. Stephanides, *Ἑκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία, ἀπ. ἀρχῆς μέχρι σήμερον* (Athens, 1948), p. 741.

138. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 22* (1826), p. 109.

139. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 70. See also R. Clogg, 'The Publication and Distribution of Karamanli Texts by the British and Foreign Bible Society Before 1850, I', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XIX (1968), 57–81.

140. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), pp. 83, 84, 88.

141. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 24* (1828), p. 85.

142. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 23* (1827), p. 59.

143. *Ibid.*

144. J. F. Clarke, *American Missionaries*, p. 140.

to the entire world through the press and to see that his revised text would not receive the Synod's permission to circulate among the Orthodox.¹⁴⁵ In this controversy, Leeves defended Hilarion, but the Bible Society had already proceeded with the printing of the revised text, which appeared in 1827.¹⁴⁶

As if the obstacle encountered by the transaction had not been enough, the Bible Society was to add another over which the translation project was to stumble both in Constantinople and later in Athens.

This latest setback originated in London, where the Bible Society became embroiled over the question of whether or not the books of the Apocrypha should be included in its editions of the Old Testament.¹⁴⁷

It appears that many Protestant churches in Europe continued to respect the Apocrypha books enough to include them in an appendix following the canonical books. Consequently, they objected to the Society's policy of excluding them from its editions.¹⁴⁸ After acceding for a time to the wishes of the Bible Societies of Berlin, Stockholm, and St. Petersburg, the chief objectors, the Society returned to its former position in 1825 and ruled out the inclusion of the Apocrypha.¹⁴⁹

As far as Hilarion was concerned, the decision to exclude the Apocrypha was not nearly as catastrophic as the one taken shortly afterward by the Society not to use his translation based on the Septuagint, but to seek another based on the Hebrew text. Hilarion's text was only to be used for reference. Again Leeves argued on behalf of Hilarion. He was also joined by Jowett, who insisted that the Septuagint be preferred for the Orthodox. The Society, however, could not be moved to alter its decision.¹⁵⁰

This misfortune came shortly before Hilarion's expulsion, in June 1827, from his episcopal see of Tirnovo for reasons unrelated to the translation question. In October of the same

145. Ibid., p. 471.

146. Ibid., p. 170. See also Darlow-Moule, *Catalogue*, II, 683.

147. G. Browne, *The History of the British and Foreign Bible Society: From its Institution in 1804 to the Close of its Jubilee in 1854. Compiled at the Request of the Jubilee Committee* (London, 1859), I, p. 94.

148. Ibid., p. 97.

149. Ibid., p. 101.

150. B.F.B.S., *Report No. 25 (1829)*, pp. xlv–l.

year, Hilarion was able to secure permission from the Ottoman authorities, responsible for his expulsion, to reside in Constantinople, where he continued to work on the Old Testament, ignorant of the fact that the Society had decided not to use it. When this knowledge finally became known to Hilarion, both he and Archbishop Konstantios joined in protesting the move. In two letters to the Society in London, Konstantios, who had worked on the translation for seven years without any monetary compensation, warned that the Society's disregard for the Septuagint would stir up the translation controversy anew. These prophetic words went unheeded.¹⁵¹

With Konstantios' accession to the Patriarchate in 1830, Hilarion was restored to his see at Tirnovo,¹⁵² where he was able to forget the injustice done to him by the Society and co-operate with Leeves and Barker in securing a New Testament for the Bulgarians.¹⁵³ In fact, he even defied the Patriarchate when it ordered him to stop the Bulgarian translation.¹⁵⁴ Of his own translating labours, only his New Testament was published in London in 1828, followed by his Book of Psalms in the same year.¹⁵⁵

Thereafter, Hilarion of Tirnovo played no active part in

151. Clarke, *American Missionaries*, p. 181.

152. Germanos, *Θρακικά*, VIII (1937), 183. The text of Hilarion's restoration on pp. 182–3.

153. Clarke, *American Missionaries*, pp. 146, 198, 231. Samouel Kypriou (Εισαγωγή, pp. lii–liiii), who feels he must 'save' Hilarion for the Orthodox Church, tells us that in the 'end' Hilarion removed himself from the translation project and had a change of heart. Further, had he lived, Samouel Kypriou speculates, Hilarion would have condemned the translation. We know, of course, that this is far from the truth. Also 'apocryphal'—to me at least—is the story, furnished again by Kypriou (ibid., pp. lii–liiii) that Hilarion was appointed by Patriarch Konstantios to refute a Protestant work appearing in Greek translation, but illness and death prevented its completion. This I believe to be an example of an attempt to remove Hilarion from the lists of those who cited him in support of the translation in Greece.

154. Clarke, *American Missionaries*, pp. 236–7. Clarke rightly believes that the Patriarchate objected to the Bulgarian translation only because it came from the Bible Society, ibid., p. 271. On the other hand, the Patriarchate had published many Bulgarian books on the Patriarchal Press.

155. Darlowe-Moule, *Catalogue*, II, 646, 683. This 1828 version of Hilarion's translated New Testament was his unrevised text. See Clarke, *American Missionaries*, p. 141.

the translation controversy. Even the Patriarchate of Constantinople ceased to be the focal point of the controversy, which shifted in the next decade to Athens and Greece for its third and most important phase. But that is another story.

What should be noted here in conclusion is that the translation of the Scriptures, supported by its advocates—both Orthodox and non-Orthodox—as a practical solution for the religious and moral enlightenment of the Greek people and Church, was rejected by the strict traditionalists on the principle, ‘move not the external boundaries which thy fathers have fixed’. Nonetheless, the supporters of the translation were unsuccessful primarily due to political and military events and not to any religious or theological principles.

*Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology,
Hellenic College,
Brookline,
Mass.*